

Remarks

Claims 1-19, 24, and 25 are currently pending in the application, claims 20-23 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 11, 18, 24, and 25 are currently amended; claims 20-23 are withdrawn, wherein claims 20 and 22 are withdrawn-currently amended. No new matter has been added. The present amendments result in the correction of claim language conforming to U.S. practice and the exclusion of particular compounds. Given the extensive disclosure of alternatives at all of the positions shown in the disclosed compounds in the specification, combined with the previously presented claim 1 having exclusion of sub-genera, as well as particular species, it is clear that Applicants were in possession of the exclusion of the compounds. Accordingly, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added to the application and that all new claims are fully supported by the specification.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claim 11 is allowed.

Priority

Applicants also note that the Office has acknowledged the claim of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau.

Restriction Requirement

The Office Action states that a potential rejoinder between product claims (claims 1-19, 24, and 25) and process claims (claims 20-23) is possible if the product claims are found allowable. Until then, the Office maintains the finality of the restriction requirement between product claims and process.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office rejects claims 1-10, 12-17, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over at least one of the following two references, already of record:

- Marsilje et al., Bioorganic & Medicinal Chemistry Letters, 2000, 10, pp. 477-481, compound 2v on page 478; and
- Butenas et al., Biochemistry, 1992, 31, 5399-5411, allegedly disclosing 5-amino-naphthalene-1-sulfonyl-benzamide.

Applicants submit that the cited documents do not render obvious the claimed invention. The Office Action relied on the cited documents for an obviousness rejection because these documents disclose compounds that were alleged to be adjacent analogues to compounds within the scope of previous claim. In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants note that compounds allegedly adjacent to those in the cited documents are no longer claimed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or questions or if any issues remain which can be expeditiously resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susumu MUTO et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

42,920

February 19, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191